

THE
THANKS
OF AN
Honest Clergyman
FOR
M^r PAUL'S
SPEECH
At TYBOURN,
JULY the 13th, 1716.

The Third Edition.

LONDON.
Printed for R. Burleigh, in Amen-Corner.
MDCCLXVI.

Price Three Pence.

THE

OF THE

MANUSCRIPTS



IN THE

THE

LONDON

Printed for R. Dugdale, in Strand-Corner.

MDCCLXVI

Printed by J. Smith, in Strand-Corner.



no Right to confer Orders, or to perform or administer
He was therefore upon his own Principles, a *Presbyterian*
Knew's Mind, to take the *Office* in a
Church, to which his Conscience told him he could have
no Right, and he was as *conscious* to himself, that he was
not the *True* Minister of a *Church*, which he was
of *Union* with the *Church*, and had no more
Power or Authority than a mere *Presbyter*.

Of an *Honest Clergyman*
I demand the *Presbyter*, and swore to the *Church*
Succession. It is as well as *known*, as well as *known*
and *known*. But more particularly *known*.

Mr PAUL's SPEECH

at Tyburn, July 19. 1716.



HE Design of Mr. Paul to move the Passions, and to seduce the Commonalty, is so evident, that there wants only a slight Comparison of his *Letters* and his *Speech* together, to lay open his most abominable Cunning, and Decit, and to disabuse the Honest Reader. I shall therefore first unmask the Man, and then the *Principles* he asserts the Truth of, and then leave even the most partial to judge for themselves. The

First Remark upon his *Speech* is, That He is no Member of the Church of England as by Law established, and

and consequently Mr Paul himself has acquitted the Government of any Design against the Church established, by his Execution. Their Design must be to strike at the Nonjuring Church, of which Mr Paul died a Dutiful and Faithful Member; and not to prejudice the Established Church, whose Communion He renounced.

2dly, Mr Paul was Ordained by a Schismatical Bishop, presented to his Living by a Schismatical Bishop, and instituted by a Schismatical Bishop, in his Notion of things: i. e. was Ordained and presented and instituted to a Living, by Persons who had no Right to confer Orders, or to present or institute. He was therefore upon his own Principles, a Dishonest, Knavish Man, to take upon himself to Officiate in a Church, to which his Conscience told him he cou'd have no Right: And He was as dishonest to assume to himself the Title and Habit of a Clergyman, when he was of Opinion that the Person Ordaining him, had no more Power or Authority than a mere Presbyter.

3dly, Mr Paul must have taken the Oaths to the late Queen for his Living at Orton; and at the same time He abjured the Pretender, and swore to the Hanover Succession. He is perjur'd therefore, as well as dishonest and knavish. But more particularly still,

4thly, He declares that He dies a Dutiful and Faithful Member of the Nonjuring Church, which has kept it self free from Rebellion: And bids us remember that King James the Third is our only Rightful Sovereign. By which He charges All that are or have been for King William, Queen Anne, and King George to be Rebels, and asserts Those Kings and the late Queen to be Usurpers, and Pretenders to the Throne: This lets us into the plain Meaning of his Letters to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Lord Townshend. He assures the Archbishop, That He never did, since He was in Newgate, pray for the Pretender by Name or Title: And he tells my Lord Townshend, That He never prayed in express Terms in Newgate for the Pretender by the name of King James. Put this into the Language of other People, and strip off the Cloak of Words, and 'tis thus, "I never did since I was in Newgate pray for King George by

"any Name or Title": And, "I never prayed in express Terms in Newgate for King George by the Name of King James." Did ever Jesuit equivocate at such egregious Rate? Could he hope to delude even Men of Common Sense with such wretched scandalous Arts and Doubles? King James it seems is owned in the Speech for his Rightful Sovereign, he says 'tis our Duty to serve Him, and we are in Conscience obliged to do all we can to restore him to his Crown. These were his Principles when he went to Preston, and at the Gallows. Either therefore we must interpret the Word Pretender of King George, to make the Man consistent with Himself, and then what *tricking shuffling* Arts are These? Or, if Pretender signifies the Person to whom every Honest Man has applied it these Eight and Twenty Years past, He acted against Principle, against his avowed Duty, against his Conscience, in promising to spend his Life in Prayers for his Majesty, (King George) and his Illustrious Family.

Again, He begs of my Lord Townshend to get his Life saved, that He might shew to the World how heartily He was sorry for all his past Errors, and promises that no Man should demonstrate it more than He would. This was wrote on Thursday night. On Friday the Speech was spoke, and there the very First thing He asks Pardon for is, for having violated his Loyalty by taking most abominable Oaths against His Lawful Sovereign King James the 3d. The second thing he asks Pardon for is, His Scandalizing People by Pleading Guilty, &c. His acknowledging King GEORGE's Right and Power. Compare these Passages, and they will amount to this Profession: "If your Lordship will procure my Life, no one shall demonstrate it more than I will, that I hate King GEORGE and all his Adherents; that I will endeavour by all the Methods I can to embroil His Affairs, sow Sedition amongst the People, and join with all that will act in Concert with me to confound the Nation in order to bring in King James." Is This the Miserable Wretch who sues for Life? Is This the Man who pleads his Gown for his Protection? Is This the Clergyman who pretends the Sacred Function struck

at thro' his Sides? Whilst he has Hopes of Life He is contriving to *Impose* on, *Trick* and *Deceive* the very Persons to whom he sues, and from whom He expects Assistance: And at the *same* time must be *writing* this very Speech, or getting Others to *make* and *write* it for Him, which was to contain the real Sentiments of his Mind, the *Direct* contrary to what He professes in his Letters.

Again. In another Letter to the Archbishop he says, *If ever I asked or advised any body to rise in Rebellion, I am willing to Suffer.* This on Monday. On Friday He tells the People: *You are obliged in Conscience to restore King James the Third to the Crown: If you have any regard to your Country, bring the King, i. e. James, to his just and undoubted Right,* and declares how glad he should be if what he said has any effect upon them, *so as to be instrumental in making Them perform their Duty, &c.* To make Mr Paul consistent with his avowed Principles, the meaning of his Letter is, "*If ever I asked or advised any body to bear true Allegiance to King GEORGE, I am willing to be hang'd.*" For to bear true Allegiance to King GEORGE, and to be sincere and hearty to his Interests, or to have been so to the late Queen, or to King William, is to rebel against the Pretender. If by Rebellion He meant the taking up Arms against King GEORGE, by his own Confession He ought to have been hang'd as he was, for his Speech; That being one continued Exhortation to Arms. Or, is it not *advising* to rebel to join with Rebels? Is there no way of expressing one's Desires but by *direct asking*? Does not He *ask* to rebel who gives his Assistance openly, and takes up Arms against his Lawful Sovereign? Is it not *asking* and *advising*, when a Man gives it as his Opinion that 'tis *Lawful, just* and *Right* to rebel? It is nothing to the purpose therefore whether He did or did not *Preach* up Rebellion, or *advise* his *Parishioners* to take up Arms by several Seditious Sermons, unless it were impossible for a Clergyman to *ask* or *advise* any body to rise in Rebellion, unless in the Pulpit.

Thus

Thus much I thought necessary concerning Mr Paul himself, not concerning my self with any Stories or Rumours about his Life or Actions; but from his own Mouth to shew him a *dishonest, knavish, tricking, shuffling, perjured Rebel*. And doth this Man pretend to be a *Martyr*, or hope to be with *Patriarchs, Prophets, and Apostles*? Then may every Parricide, every Traytor, and every Murderer hope for Heaven, and dye with the false Pleasure of thinking that He hath done God good Service.

I shall next consider Mr Paul's Principles, which he has taken the Opportunity of his Dying to inculcate upon the People, in order to poison their Minds, and to make himself thought a Saint. They are These. First, That the *Nonjuring Church* is the only *Lawful Church of England*; or as in the Speech made for Mr Hall, 'tis the *true Catholick Church of England*. The 2d is, That the *Revolution* was a *Rebellion*. The 3d is, That the *Revolution* has introduced *Atheism* and *Heresy*. The 4th is, That the *Pretender* has the only *Lawful Right* to the Crown. The 5th is, The *Security* we shall have of our *Religion, Laws and Liberties* if the *Pretender* succeeds to the Crown. And Lastly, That the Church is struck at by his Execution. His

First Principle is, *That the Nonjuring Church is the Only Lawful Church of England*; or, as Mr Hall's Speech has it, *the true Catholick Church of England*. To shew the Fallacy and Absurdity of this, I observe,

First, That the Words *Catholick Church* comprehend and always signify, *All Christian People*; All that in all parts of the World make Profession of the Christian Religion. So that the *Catholick Church of England* is, All the Christian People that dwell all over the Universe of England. Or if the Word must be confined to signify, *All the Christian People of England*, then the meaning of, *The Nonjuring Church is the only true Catholick Church of England*, must be, That *all the Christians of England* are *Nonjurors*, or the *Nonjurors* are *all the Christian People of England*. All which is unintelligible Jargon and Nonsense; the Stuff which Papists alone can swallow, who pretend the Church of Rome to be the Catholick

Catholick or a Catholick Church. But perhaps it will be said, that the word, *Catholick*, relates to Doctrines *universally* receiv'd; and then the Meaning of, *The Nonjuring Church is the true Catholick Church of England*, is, That Society of Men who refuse to take the Oaths to KING GEORGE, are the *only* Society or Church of England who maintain a Truth *universally* receiv'd; which is a Contradiction in Terms. 2dly, This Assertion may be allowed if by *Catholick*, be meant Roman Catholick; for then 'twill be Sense to say, *The Nonjuring Church is the only true Roman Catholick Church of England*. And if this be their Meaning, 'tis declaring all the *Nonjurors* to be really *Papists*. 3dly, *The Church of England* is, the People who join together in *Worship*, in *Doctrines*, and in *Discipline*, according to the *Liturgy*, *Articles*, *Canons* and *Laws* established in England for those Purposes. When therefore 'tis asserted that All who went into King William, Queen Ann, and KING GEORGE are of the *Revolution Schismatical Church*; and *Communion is renounced* with all such, 'tis evident that the *Nonjuring Church* is reputed the *Only Church of England*. That is, The *Nonjurors* are the *Only*, the *All* of the People of England who join together in *Worship*, *Doctrines*, and *Discipline*, according to the *Liturgy*, &c. established. Is this their Meaning of the Word, *Catholick*? If so, It must be proved by them that Resistance in all possible Cases is absolutely forbid by our Liturgy, Articles, Canons, &c. And when This is made out very clear, they must prove it *unlawful in itself*, ever to resist; For our Liturgy, Canons, and Laws, *supposing* a settled, regular State of Affairs, Cases of Necessity are *Superior* to Them, and have a *Prior* Obligation, and make that which is *contrary* to settled Laws, *regular and lawful*. When they have proved Resistance unlawful in it self, then they must prove it unlawful to join in Communion with Men of another Perswasion or Practice: For why can't a Man join in Prayer to God with a Man that has *resisted* an Evil Prince, as well as he can frequent a Church where perhaps may be *Whoremongers* and *Adulterers*, or *Thieves* or *Drunkards*? Dr *Sacheverel*, Mr *Milbourn*, and many others who hold the

Unlawfulness

Unlawfulness of Resistance in any Cases, yet do not break Communion with Others on that Account, and would take it very ill, not to be thought of the Church of England. Cannot a Man join in Communion with Another without an Approbation of his Crimes? What Law of our Saviour is there that forbids us to join in Common Prayer with such whose Principles and Practices we do not approve of? When these things are clearly proved, which never have been yet, and I may venture to say, never will be, then may the Nonjurors assume to Themselves to be the Only, True, Catholick Church of England. 4thly, The Nonjurors can't pray for a King, who in their Opinions had no Right to the Kingdom; Therefore They conclude that They are the Only, True, Catholick Church of England. A Conclusion just like This, The Papists cannot comply with the Settlement made at the Reformation, Therefore They are the only true Catholick Church of England. Which Arguments, and many more of that sort, suppose that what is once the Tenet of the Church can never, in no Circumstances, suffer an Alteration. Their Plea for not taking the Oaths is founded upon this, That 'twas unlawful and contrary to the Doctrine of the Church to take up Arms against a Prince in Cases of most absolute Necessity. Which way will This be proved to be the Doctrine of the Church, and not rather the false Interpretations and Glosses put upon her Doctrines, by Men that misunderstood her Meaning? And what an everlasting Source of Schism is here, if Men shall think themselves at Liberty to set up separate Congregations, and to appropriate to themselves the Title of the Only True Church of England, whenever they through Interest, Humour or Prejudice, shall mistake the Doctrines of a Church? Were They indeed to argue thus, The Nonjurors cannot pray for the King, Therefore They cannot come to the Church established, 'twould be much more justifiable than to conclude as they do, Therefore They are the Only Church established. But even This would not justify their separate Meetings, unless by Them a greater Good accrued to Christianity, than the Breach of Unity is an Evil. 5thly, The Revolution Church, is All

All who adhered to King William, Queen Anne, and KING GEORGE were guilty of Rebellion; But the Nonjuring Church has preserved it self free from that Crime? What then? Therefore the Nonjuring Church is the *true* Church of England. A strange Consequence, and as far from the Premises as This, You are in the Wrong, therefore I am Right. This is Black, Therefore that is White. Supposing the Revolution Church wrong in the Measures which they took, may not the Nonjuring Church be wrong in the Measures They took too! Whether the Revolution was a Rebellion I shall consider afterwards; at the present we'll suppose it so. Doth that *unchurch* the Men concerned in it, and make Them *Schismatics*. Hath the taking up Arms against a Prince a more peculiar Malignity, undoing the Relation to the Church, more than other Crimes? What Repugnancy or Contradiction is there between Church and Rebellion, that He which is guilty of This must be a *Schismatick* more immediately, than a Felon, or a Murderer, or any other more grievous Criminal? If there be none, then how is it an Argument that the Nonjuring Church is the *true, only*, Church of England, because the *Revolution*, that is, the Present Established Church, was guilty of Rebellion?

But the Revolution Church is a Schismatical Church, whose Bishops set themselves up in Opposition to the Orthodox Fathers who were unlawfully and invalidly deprived by the Prince of Orange?

To this I reply, That there is not I conceive such a Necessary Connection or Relation of any particular Person to a particular District, that if He be deprived, a Nation must rise up as One Man to his rescue, or else They must be *Schismatics*. Where has Christ or his Apostles taught such Tenets? If therefore a Bishop refuses to obey his Lawful Superiors, (such was the Then King as I shall prove hereafter,) in a Lawful Command, and in consequence of this He be deprived of those Dignities and Titles which He received from His Prince, They are not Schismatics who *desert* him, but such as *join* with him in His Obstinacy. But suppose Those Bishops *unjustly* deprived, yet Men that have God and

his

his Christ entirely at Heart, wou'd rather quietly recede and submit to what They could not help, and rejoice that they had done their best whilst they had the Power, rather than make a *Schism* in the Church on account of Dominion, and Honour, and Dignity. The Church They saw supplied by others, and no danger of Christianity's declining for want of proper Governours; They therefore were the Schismatics who separated from the Establishment upon such Trifles, and not those who kept close to their *Liturgy, Canons, Doctrine and Disciplins*. Interest and Faction is always more powerful than Religion, when Separations are made on such Accounts; and tho' Church is the Cry, 'tis the Revenues belonging to it, and the Hopes of Power and Rule that are the true Springs of such Measures. The deprived Bishops were deprived of nothing by the Civil Magistrate but what They receiv'd from the Civil Magistrate; and so much cou'd be forfeited, and so much cou'd be lawfully resumed. If any therefore can separate from an established Church for the sake of Riches and Honours, and yet be innocent of the Crime of *Schism*, 'Twill be impossible to fix *Schism* upon any Man. But put the Case as far as it is possible, that the Bishops were reduced to the State of *meer Laymen*, and after their Deprivations cou'd neither confer Orders, nor Preach nor administer the Sacraments; put it even thus; what is their either in *Reason* or *Revelation*, that shou'd hinder a Prince from preventing *such* or *such a particular* Person to be a Minister of the Gospel in his Dominions, when He suffers it to be *freely preach'd*, and *freely embraced* by others? Why may He not for the sake of the Publick Peace and Welfare, and for the better Propagation of Christianity, put a stop to *Seditious* Persons, and actually silence them; whilst He *freely* permits the true Spirit of Christ to be preached, and encourages and promotes with the greatest Favours the true Servants of their Lord? If there be any *Reason*, or if there be any *Revelation* against This, then may the Nonjurors stave off in some Measure the Guilt of Schism; but till they can shew the Contradiction of this to the One or the Other, we may rest assured that the *Revolution Church* (if that must be its Name) is not Schismatical. The B Second

Second Principle laid down by the Nonjurors, is, *That the Revolution was a Rebellion*, and in consequence of that All Acts done upon that Foundation are sinful, or *ipso facto* void. To this I reply

First, The End of Government, be it of what sort it will, is the *Good* of Mankind; and That *Good* is to be measured not by the Splendor of Courts, or the Luxurious way of Living of some few Richer People, but by the *Ease* and *Happiness*, and *Liberty* of the Subjects. When therefore the Subjects are deprived of their Happiness and their Liberties are invaded, and all that is Sacred and dear to them is forced from them, the very *End* of Government is subverted, and the *Reason* of *Subjection* ceases. When King *James* therefore *dispensed* with our *Laws*, and by that means in effect took them quite away, when He levied Money to and for the use of the Crown without Grant of Parliament; when He rais'd a standing Army without Consent of Parliament, broke through in every respect his Coronation Oath, deprived us of our Liberties, endeavoured to extirpate the Protestant Religion, and subverted the Constitution it self, the *Reason* of *Subjection* to Him ceas'd, and the People were justified in making that Provision for themselves, which occasion'd the Loss of his Regal Dignity. Nor could this be called *Rebellion*; For *Necessity* makes the difference between *Resistance* and *Rebellion*, just as Moral Circumstances do the difference between Virtue and Vice. 2dly, Let the Origin of Government be as it will, either from *Compact* and *Consent*, which History plainly confirms; Or let the fantastical *Patriarchal* Scheme be looked upon as true: Or carry it higher still, That Kings reign by the immediate Appointment of God himself; yet as long as the *Authority* of Princes is given them *only* for the *Benefit* of Mankind, when They exercise the Power *not* for the *Benefit* of Mankind, they have *no* Commission from God in such Instances. When a Nation therefore is brought to Ruin by the ill Administration of Tyrants, to resist them, is not to resist God, but to act agreeably to his Will. 'Tis the Will of God that his Creatures should act according to the Powers he gives them, and

to the Commissions He intrusts them with. But such as exceed their Commissions, cannot in any Sense be said to act according to their Commissions, and therefore such who oppose these Excesses do not offend God. 3dly. Supposing that at the Revolution there really was a Rebellion, and King William was an Usurper, yet are the Nonjurors infinitely absurd and wrong in their Consequences, when they infer from thence the Invalidity of all Acts of Government done since. An Usurpation no longer continues than the People are debarr'd the Liberty of consenting. Whilst any one is in Possession of Power, not by the Methods which the Laws of a Nation determine, and contrary to the Will and Consent of the People He can have no Right on his side, nor ought He to command Obedience. But then when the People are at their Liberties and may consent, and actually do confirm the Power and Authority which any one has, and this is done freely, without Compulsion, 'tis no longer an Usurpation, but a free, settled, regular Government. Suppose therefore the Nation depriv'd of their Liberty under KING WILLIAM, and suppose him to be an Usurper, yet their Consent to KING GEORGE was perfectly free; Both Parties of the Nation at several times uniting in the late Queen's time, in the confirmation of his future Power, and since, in the Actual Possession of it. 4thly. Let King James the 2d derive his Authority how the Nonjurors please, I do not doubt but it may be proved that KING GEORGE derives his by as good a Title. If an Usurper can never have a good Title, nor Any descending from him; if an indelible Stain continues which can never after be washed away, How came King James himself to have a Title clear and indisputable to the Crown of England? The Family of the Stuarts cou'd have no better Title than they cou'd derive from King Henry 7th. who yet never dared to stand to his Hereditary Right. So that upon their Principles the Pretender can have no better Right, than they Themselves allow to KING GEORGE, that is none at all. What absurd, inconsistent, ridiculous Schemes then do the Nonjurors embrace, and what slender Twigs do they lay hold of, to save a sinking Cause?

How monstrously do They impose on the credulous Vulgar, and how close do They cover Interest, Ambition, Faction, and Rebellion under the Cloak of Church, Usurpation and Hereditary Right? A

Third Pretence made use of is, *That the Revolution has introduced Atheism and Heresy.* To this I reply,

First, There is no more necessary Relation between the *Revolution* and *Atheism* or *Heresy*, than there is between *Christianity* and *Quarrels* amongst the nighest Relations. Yet because *Christianity* occasioned These, as our Saviour foretold it wou'd, is it therefore to be banished the World, to be treated with Scorn and Contempt, and thought the Foundation of all Evils? Supposing therefore the *Revolution* had occasioned *Atheism* and *Heresy*, yet it might be valuable in it self, however abused. *Secondly*, What is it that is meant by *Atheism*? Not the Denial of the Being of a God; For I challenge any one to prove that there are more *Atheists*, in that Sense of the Word, Now, than there were before the *Revolution*. No. But they mean an Opposition to a Slavish Dependance upon what is imposed by some injudicious Clergymen as necessary to Salvation; An honest Vindication of the Scriptures, and of the Rights of Mankind to judge for themselves. The Men who insist on these things are those who are painted as *Atheists*, and represented as the *Confounders* of all Religion, by weak and injudicious Persons; by such as think an impartial Examination a real *Prejudice* to Religion; whereas in truth and reality, 'tis a *Prejudice* only to *Craft*, to *Ignorance* and *Superstition*. The *Revolution* indeed gave us This Advantage amongst many others; And may the Advantage last till time shall be no more! But I proceed---The *Atheism* of the Speechmaker is the too common *Disrespect* to the Clergy. We have had indeed too much *Occasion* given, and too much taken since the *Revolution* of railing at the Clergy. But then the Cause is, not the *Revolution*, but the *Senseless Politicks* of some who would enslave the State, and make Religion a Stalking-Horse to their Ambition; 'tis the *Rebellion*, the *Treason*, the *Perjury* of some that makes the rest of the
Order

Order despised and trampled on. One Man's being amply rewarded for what in Justice ought to have *silenc'd* him for ever, hath made so many engage in this Lottery, to Spirit up the Nation, and Fire the deluded People. Whenever Men endeavour to confound all things for the sake of Traytors to their Countries, They will always be evil spoken of and abused ; and, what is a very wrong and fatal Inference, if Clergymen do so, Religion will be thought Cant and Nonsense. But then the way for them to avoid this, is to behave themselves as the Messengers of Peace, to inculcate Peace and Quietness, to teach Submission to their present lawful Superiours, and the *Atheism* complain'd of, will quickly dwindle to nothing. If by *Atheism* is design'd any thing further, I ask, was the Foundation of so many *Charity Schools* the Effects of *Atheism*? Is the Instruction given to so many Poor Children, designed to make Them lay aside all regard to *Piety* and *Goodness*? Are the Lives of Great Men more *vicious* Now than they were in the Reigns of King *Charles* the Second, and King *James*? Are their Debaucheries more flagrant *now* than They were *Then*? Dare any one say, who has either Truth or Modesty left, that the Court since the *Revolution*, has *encouraged* or *patroniz'd*, or *practis'd* any *Looseness* or *Prophaness*, as it is known to have done it before? Is not the Stage amended? Is the Society for *Reformation of Manners* an *Atheistical Club*, or intended for That End? With what Face then is *Atheism* said to be *introduced* by the *Revolution*, or which way can it be made appear ; since we have so many *publick* Instances of the Promotion of Virtue more since that time than in Four times the number of Years before? But the Business was to serve the Cause, and dash through every thing, and throw out Lies enough ; and there cou'd be no more lucky Opportunity, than to get a Clergyman to dye with a Lye in his Mouth, to be the Tool.

But *Heresies* abound, and the Teachers of False Doctrines are *patroniz'd* by the Great Men in the Government. Is it not *false Doctrine* to preach up *Rebellion*? Is it not such to teach *Perjury* and *Sedition*? And have not *Ormond* and *Bolingbroke* and *Mar* been Patrons

Patrons of such? *One* such *False Doctrine* as these is infinitely more *Damnable* than all the *Heresies* which He pretends to be patroniz'd by the *Great Men in the Government*. 2dly, What doth He call *Heresy*? Doth He know that to be an Heretick, if St Paul knew what *Heresy* was, a Man must be *Condemned of himself*? Titus, 3. 10. Doth He know how *innocent* a thing 'tis to be *mistaken*, where a Man has used his best endeavours to find Truth? Or can it be prov'd that the Men whom He alludes to, are mistaken? But when the World is to be impos'd on, and Dirt is to be thrown, 'tis right to make use of Words without *Meaning*; and when so proper a time for the purpose, (and when so scandalously dishonest) as in a *Dying Speech*? A

4th Principle asserted by Mr Paul is, *That King James the Third is our only Rightful Sovereign by the Laws of the Land*. To this I reply,

First, This takes for granted that the *Revolution* was founded on *Rebellion*; which I have already shewn to be false. It supposes too the present happy Establishment to be an *Usurpation*, and all its Acts void on that Account; which is false too, as is already proved: It supposes too that in *no case*, and in *no Circumstances* the Heir apparent to a Crown can be set aside. Suppose the *Pretender* to be the Son of King James the Second, can He not be excluded? What *Law of God* is there which forbids it? What is there in *Reason* which forbids us to provide for the Security of the Nation, by preventing the Succession of a Person to our Throne, whose Principles are absolutely inconsistent with our Civil and with our Religious Interests? What is there that makes the *Pretender's Right* unalienable? Is there *Here* too an *uninterrupted Succession* of Hereditary Right? But 2dly, How shall we know the *Pretender* to be his Son? Did not the Nation suspect it always? Has it not been Questioned these Eight and Twenty Years past? Or, what peculiar Light has broke in of late which has convinced Mens Understandings? 3dly, If the Laws of the Land are to be our Unvariable Rule in this Case, it will follow directly that the *Pretender* cannot be our *Rightful Sovereign* by those Laws, because all the Persons who

who by those very Laws were required to be present at his Birth, were confin'd in Custody, or obliged to be absent from the Queen at that Time. If that Circumstance was design'd on purpose to prevent the Nation's being impos'd on, the Non-compliance with it cuts off even the Pretence of *Right by Law*. The

5th Principle, or rather bare Assertion is, *That we shall be secure and Happy if the Pretender succeeds to our Throne.* King James has promis'd to protect and defend the Church of England, and has given his Royal Word to consent to such Laws as You Your selves shall think necessary for its Preservation. To this Security for our Religion, and our Liberties (which by the by are no where promised) we have this Threat added, *That till He is restored, the Nation can never be happy.* I observe,

First, That the Threat (made before in other Traytors Speeches) amounts to this, That the *Jacobite* Faction is resolv'd never to be at Peace, or to let the Government enjoy any *Quiet*, till they have gained their Ends, and brought their Tool to the Throne; And They have the *Impudence* to tell the World so. Is this Encouragement to shew *Mercy* to such Offenders? Are these the People whom 'tis *Cruelty* to punish, when all of them to a Man promise, never to be at Rest? Must the Nation be always alarmed with *Rebels*, and the Government insulted for providing a *little* for its Security? Or do They think to frighten and scare away the King? 'Tis not *Mercy* to pardon such *Harden'd, Obstinate* Traytors, but 'twould be *Cruelty* and *Injustice* to the Country to spare them. But 2dly, as the *Threat* is but Wind, the *Promise* is no better. Would a *Papist* suffer a *Protestant* to enjoy a quiet Profession of his Religion, when he has it in his Power to prevent it? No. A Protestant Nation never yet enjoyed any Peace under a Popish Governour. The Challenge has been often made, and never that I have heard of answered, That if ever there was in any Kingdom of the World so much as *One* Instance of a Popish Prince who has kept his Promise to his Protestant Subjects, when he has had it in his Power to break it; If so much as *One* can be named who has let them enjoy their Religion without Disturbance

bance, to produce such an Instance, and take off this strong Objection against their Master. But there never yet was One produced, nor never will be for this plain Reason, because 'tis inconsistent with the Oaths He is under, with his Religion, with what He thinks his Salvation depends on, to keep such a Promise. To trust therefore a *Papist* with the Custody of our Religion, is like trusting a *Pick-pocket* with our Money, or a *Knight of the Post* with our Reputation. Why should we trust the Honour and Honesty of any Man in what He must be dishonest to keep his Word. Why should any Man run such a Hazard to change for what He has all the Probability in the World will ruin Him? Who will run such a Venture in his Trade, or in his Estate, when He can get nothing, and may lose every thing? The

Last Assertion is, *That the Church is struck at by this Execution.* To this I reply,

First, This is just as if one should assert all the *Magistrates* in England to be struck at, because a *Justice of the Peace* is hanged: Or All the *Officers* of the Army are to be made away with, because Colonel *Oxburgh* was executed. 2dly. What is there in our Constitution which forbids a Magistrate to punish a Clergyman if He turns *Rebel*? Or is it a Breach upon the Church to punish a disorderly Member? No. The Church is vindicated, and its Honour and its Safety is consulted, when at any time a scandalous Member of it meets with his due Deserts; just as 'tis a Security to the Body to have a gangreen'd mortified Limb cut off. 3dly. Who is it that brings a Disgrace upon the Gown, and strikes at the Church, the Clergyman that is for raising a Rebellion in his Country, and that preaches nothing but Sedition, or, He that removes such a Disgrace from the Gown? The Clergyman that plays with Oaths, and perjures himself and teaches Others to do so, Or, He that takes away such Scandal from the Sacred Function, and punishes the Offenders as Reason, Equity, and Law direct? 4thly. This Assertion is nothing but an Encouragement to fresh Rebellion, A Priest of the Church of England, says Mr Paul, murdered for doing his Duty! One would think by this that the Man was hang'd for preaching Christ and Christianity, for using the Com-

on Prayer, visiting the Sick, or administering the Sacraments regularly. Whereas his Just Punishment was for giving a hand in *Rebellion*, endeavouring to subvert our Religion, to *betray* our *Liberties*, to *give* up our Religion, bring in a *poor-spirited, half-witted* Wretch to the throne, whom they might make a Tool off as they pleas'd. 4thly. The Church is struck at by this Execution, and He was executed for doing his Duty. Was it his Duty to drinking Confusion and Damnation to the KING and his Illustrious Family! Was it his Duty to join with Traytors? Or, to encourage *Sedition* amongst the People? Was it his Duty to *perjure* himself? Was it his Duty to be an Assistant in the Action at *Preston*, where so many *valiant* Gentlemen lost their Lives? If his Friends will indicate his Conduct in these Points, 'twill be easy to indicate it as the Duty of the Government to execute Him or it. 6thly. Then only is a Nation well governed, when impartial Justice is distributed, and neither *Clergyman* nor *Layman* escapes, if he be a *Wilful obstinate* Offender; and 'tis the Glory of a Prince and of his Ministry to keep Justice blind, and her Scales Equal. The Question ought never to be, is the Person This or That, but, is he guilty? was he willingly guilty? Is he convinc'd of the Injustice of his former Proceedings? Is he resolv'd for the future to behave himself otherwise? In such Cases Mercy is fit and proper. But if *Guilt* be accompanied with *Insolence*, with *Resolution* to continue the same *Obstinate* Offender, *Mercy* and *Pardon* are inexcusable Follies. Since therefore Mr Paul insisted on it, as *Loyalty* to *rebel*, and to *teach* others to do so, and thought it his Duty to act as He had done; since He pleaded his Crown for his *Protection*, and his *Sacred Function* for his *Justification*; Every honest *Clergyman* will think good *Service* done to the Church, by removing such a scandal from it; and will rejoice at his Execution, (however sorry they may be at his deserving it,) because 'twill be a Testimony of their hearty Disapprobation of his *Famous* *Rebellious* *Tenets*.

From what I have said, I leave every one to judge of Mr Paul, his *Principles* and *Practices*: As for my self, upon a fair and impartial Examination of them, I cannot but

but give him my hearty and *publick* Acknowledgments for what he has said and done.

I Thank Him for giving us such a *Publick Warning* of the *Restlessness* of the *Jacobites*; and Enemies of the Government, and for his doing it at a time when we may believe he spoke the Truth.

I Thank him for *disowning* the *Church of England* as by Law established; For tis clearing the *Church* of the Doctrines which He has espoused.

I thank him for speaking in that *plain* and *open* Manner he did; because it will convince every body that can but read, and that has but one Grain of Sense, that He was a *perjured* Rebel.

I Thank him for acting a Part at *Tyburn* which lets the World know, how *judiciously* the Government chooses the Persons who are to suffer, how *well* They know their Temper and Behaviour, and How *justly* They act in Executing those they pitch on.

I Thank him for going in his *Habit* to the *Gallows*; for by that He has shewn to all the World, that a Gown is not an infallible Mark of *even being a Member* of the *Church of England*: And thereby has given this publick Testimony, that those Gentlemen who approve of the late Steps against the Government either in Publick or Private, are not to be depended on or reputed as Members of our Church, tho' They wear Gowns.

I thank him for his Letters to the *Archbishop* and the *Lord Townshend*; for they have shewn him not to have Sense enough to write common English, and consequently that *Ignorance* was the Foundation of his *Zeal* and *Affection* to the Pretender. And Lastly,

I thank the Government for *executing* Him, because they have removed a Scandal from the Gown he used to wear, and an Offence from the Sacred Function he pretended to belong to.

July 23.
1716.

F I N I S.

nents

ry of

Go-

y be-

land

f the

Man-

t can

t He

n lets

ooses

their

n Ex-

low;

rown

f the

black

e late

yate,

f our

I the

have

uent-

and

cause

ed to

n he